

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

LETTERS PATENT APPEAL No 116 of 1987

in

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1049 of 1985

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE J.M.PANCHAL

and

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

MS DAVE DY. CO ORDINATOR

Versus

GUJARAT STATE CIVIL SUPPLIES CORPORATION LTD

Appearance:

MR GN SHAH for Appellant

MR YN OZA for Respondent No. 1

MR BR GUPTA for Respondent No. 2

MR BR SHAH for Respondent No. 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE J.M.PANCHAL

and

Date of decision: 21/03/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

(Per : Panchal, J.)

This appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent is directed against judgment dated December 18, 1985, rendered by the learned Single Judge in Special Civil Application No. 1049/85, by which the appellant was directed to consider the application of the respondent no.1 for L.P.G. distributorship on merits and decide the same in accordance with law.

The learned Counsel for the appellant on instructions states at the Bar that the appeal has become infructuous and, therefore, the same may be disposed of accordingly.

Pursuant to directions given by the learned Single Judge in Special Civil Application No.1049/85, the appellant had considered the application of the respondent no.1 for L.P.G. distributorship on merits and had decided the same in accordance with law. Under the circumstances, the statement made at the Bar that the appeal has become infructuous and should be disposed of deserves to be accepted. As the appeal has become infructuous, the same requires to be disposed of accordingly.

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal fails and is dismissed, with no order as to cost. The appeal stands disposed of as having become infructuous.

21.3.2000 (J.M.Panchal,J.) (A.M.Kapadia,J.)

(patel)